



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,776	10/20/2003	Kyung Su Chae	0465-0990P	9604
2292 7590 05/30/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER				
MILLER, MICHAEL G				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/30/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/687,776

Applicant(s)

CHAE ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL G. MILLER

Art Unit

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1) Examiner notes the following amendments to the claims:
 - a) Claim 1 is amended to contain the subject matter of Claims 10 and 13. This amendment adds no new matter to the case and is therefore accepted.
 - b) Claims 10 and 13-14 are canceled.
- 2) The status of claims in the case is as follows:
 - a) Claims 1-9 and 11-12 are under examination.
 - b) Claims 10 and 13-14 are canceled.
1. Claims 15-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 21 September 2007.

Response to Arguments

- 3) Applicant's arguments filed 29 FEB 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4) Applicant's first argument is that the limitation wherein the transferring part to transfer the substrate from the printing part to the drying part must include a transfer robot which elevates the substrate is not fairly taught in the art. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the rejection of Claim 10 in the previous Office Action, Satoi ('384) teaches the use of a robot capable of changing the

elevation of a substrate to transfer substrates from a conveyor belt to a station and from a station to a conveyor belt. This is a clear teaching of the use of a robot to transfer a substrate between regions of a process, and the robot is clearly capable of elevating the substrate in the course of the transfer. One skilled in the art would be able to choose the taught robot from a finite number of choices with a reasonable expectation of success.

- 5) Applicant's second argument is that the limitation of positioning the drying part directly and vertically above the printing part is not fairly taught by the prior art. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the rejection of Claims 1 and 13 in the previous Office Action, '384 teaches a printing part, a drying part and a transferring part in a device usable for forming an alignment layer of a display apparatus. The most discussed embodiment is a linear apparatus; however, '384 makes a clear teaching that the units can be modular with the substrates individually transferred between modules. Fairbairn ('667) teaches that stacking of process modules, one above the other, reduces the floor space required for a process and allows for more efficient use of space. Efficient use of clean room floor space is a problem recognized by Applicant and makes '667 clearly analogous. This makes the combination of '384 and '667 obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, as '384 teaches a modular process and '667 teaches an advantage to stacking the modules of said process. At this point, all that is left is the order in which the modules are stacked. There are two possible permutations for stacking two modules; in this case, the drying part can be stacked over the printing

Art Unit: 1792

part or the printing part can be stacked over the drying part. '667 shows in Figure 1 a pair of enclosed modules aligned directly over/under each other; the enclosed modules address the issue of contamination raised by Applicant in the arguments. One skilled in the art would be able to choose the claimed permutation from the finite number of choices with a reasonable expectation of success. '384/'667 discloses the claimed invention except for the relative location of the drying and printing parts. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to locate the drying part directly and vertically above the printing part, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention only involves routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

- 6) As both of Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive, all grounds of rejection from the previous Office Action are maintained, with the incorporation of Claims 10 and 13 into Claim 1 necessitated by amendment. These grounds of rejection are reprinted below for the Applicant's convenience.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8) The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- (1) Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- (2) Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- (3) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- (4) Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

- 9) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 10) As these claims are drawn to a device, portions of the claim which do not define physical structure will be given limited patentable weight to the extent that they provide requirements that the device must be capable of.
- 11) Claims 1-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato (US Patent 6,331,384, hereinafter '384) and Fairbairn et al (US Patent 6,176,667, hereinafter '667).
- 12) With regard to Claim 1, '384 teaches a device usable for forming an alignment layer of a display apparatus, the device comprising:
- a) A printing part (Column 12 Lines 36-64, specifically the stage 52) to print an alignment layer on a substrate;

- b) A drying part (Column 13 Lines 1-15, specifically referencing heating apparatus 208) to dry the alignment layer printed on the substrate; and
- c) A transferring part (Column 14 Lines 36-49 discussing conveyors and robots) to transfer the substrate including a transfer robot to transfer the substrate from the printing part to the drying part by elevating the substrate ('384 Column 14 Line 60 – Column 15 Line 27 details a robot capable of motion in the vertical and radial directions of cylindrical coordinates; choosing a robot for this transfer would be one of a finite number of choices that a person skilled in the art would be able to choose between with a reasonable expectation of success).
- d) '384 does not teach that the drying part is disposed directly and vertically above the printing part. However, '384 teaches that its linear embodiment is only exemplary and that the units can be individual with substrates transferred individually (Column 18 Lines 38-45).
- e) '667 teaches that stacking process chambers above each other can reduce the floor space needed for a process, allowing for more efficient use of space. This speaks to a problem stated by Applicant of more efficiently using clean room space. Further, '667 shows a pair of enclosed modules aligned directly over/under each other (Figure 1, items A1 and A2; Column 3 Lines 11-19).
- f) Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the apparatus of '384 by adding the teaching of '667 to stack the portions of the apparatus because '384

teaches that the portions of the apparatus can be modular and '667 teaches that stacking modular apparatuses improves the optimization of floor space.

- g) As far as the limitation of disposing the drying part above the printing part, this claim would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options with his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In a stacked system consisting of a printing part and a drying part, there are two permutations that these can be stacked in (e.g., drying over printing and printing over drying). One of ordinary skill in the art could have chosen from either of these options with an equally reasonable expectation of success. '384/'667 discloses the claimed invention except for the relative location of the drying and printing parts. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to locate the drying part directly and vertically above the printing part, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention only involves routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

13)With regard to Claim 2, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, further comprising:

- a) At least one inkjet head ('384 Column 12 Lines 36-49) to spray an alignment material onto the substrate and thereby print the alignment layer and being positioned between the printing part and the drying part ('384 Figure 7 shows the inkjet head above the printing part, which is below the drying part by the discussion above).

14)With regard to Claim 3, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 2, wherein:

- a) At least one array of inkjet heads is positioned in one line according to a long side or a short side of the substrate ('384 Column 19 Lines 42-49) to print the alignment layer onto the long or short side of the substrate at one time.

15)With regard to Claim 4, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 3, wherein:

- a) A size and an arrangement of the inkjet heads are varied according to a size and a kind of the substrate ('384 Column 8 Line 62 – Column 9 Line 26; if a mono-color filter is desired, all the print heads print one color as discussed in Column 18 Lines 46-49; and the width of printing is determined by the maximum width of the substrate as discussed in Column 19 Lines 42-49).

16)With regards to Claim 5 and 6, '384 teaches a print table to receive the substrate and an inkjet head ('384 Column 12 Lines 36 – 51, talking about moving a print stage and driving an inkjet head assembly); as each of these parts can be moved independently, the apparatus can function by moving the substrate under the stationary inkjet head (Claim 5) or by moving the inkjet over the stationary plate (Claim 6).

17)With regard to Claim 7, '384/'667 teach that the coatings are applied by inkjet deposition. Polyimide PI is capable of being deposited by inkjet and therefore the device taught in claim 1 is capable of meeting the limitation of claim 7.

18)With regards to Claim 8 and 9, '384/'667 teaches the device of claim 1, wherein:

- a) The drying part includes a dry table ('384 Column 10 Lines 62-65 teaches an oven; Column 9 Lines 47-50 teach that hot plates and hot-air ovens are

interchangeable in this process) to dry the alignment layer printed on the substrate by emitting heat.

19)With regard to Claim 11, it is well known in the art that alignment layers can be provided in LCD devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a device capable of printing alignment layers for the purpose of printing alignment layers in LCD devices.

20)With regard to Claim 12, '384/667 teaches that it is known to manufacture electronic components in clean rooms ('667 Column 1 Lines 5 – 30).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1792

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL G. MILLER whose telephone number is (571)270-1861. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Cleveland can be reached on (571) 272-1418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Miller/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

/Michael Cleveland/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792